

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-48 were in the application as filed. The Examiner previously required restriction between alleged patentably distinct inventions, and Applicant provisionally elected the Examiner's alleged Invention I, claims 2-22. Claims 23-48 were withdrawn from further consideration. The Examiner has now identified the following allegedly patentably distinct species:

- A). The reinforcing element depicted by element 30; and
- B). The reinforcing element depicted by element 32.

The Examiner asserts that at least claim 1 is generic. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the withdrawal of the restriction requirement in light of the arguments advanced herein. Alternatively, Applicants provisionally elect the claims of Species A, claims 1-7 and 12-21, with traverse.

The Examiner has required restriction between alleged Species A and Species B, both of which comprise a vehicular mirror system having reinforcing elements associated with a pivot connection. The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed as being improper.

Restriction may be required if two or more "independent and distinct" inventions are claimed in one application. 35 U.S.C. §121. Alleged Species A and B have the unifying concept of a vehicular mirror system comprising a base and a support arm, the support arm being pivotable relative to the base through a pivot connection coupling the support arm to the base. A multi-component reinforcing element is associated with the pivot connection to strengthen the pivot connection. Thus, the species are not independent and distinct.

Moreover, a search of the prior art would not be duplicative and Applicants are at a loss as to how the Examiner would be burdened by having to examine all the groups of claims since they relate to such intertwined subject matter.

There is good reason to maintain all species claims in the application for examination pending allowance of the generic claim. Each species operates in essentially the same general

Serial No. 10/710,941
Filed: 08/13/2004
Page 3 of 3

Examiner: Ricky D. Shafer
Group Art Unit: 2872

manner. The number of species, i.e. 2, is not unreasonable. The burden of maintaining the claims in the application is negligible, and far outweighed by the burden of continuing examination of the withdrawn claims in separate applications. Nevertheless, Applicants confirm a provisional election with traverse of alleged Species A, claims 1-7 and 12-21.

CONCLUSION

If there are any outstanding issues which the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned to resolve these issues. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. RUSE ET AL.

Dated: August 24, 2006

By: /Michael F Kelly/
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
MCGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0246402.DOC